DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 450 077 SP 039 751

AUTHOR LoVette, Otis; Watts, Susie; Hood, Joanne

TITLE An Investigation of Teachers' Perceptions of Their Principals' "Delegation" and "Relationships" Behavior.

PUB DATE 2000-11-00

NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Bowling Green, KY, November 15-17, 2000).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Characteristics; *Administrator Effectiveness; *Age Differences; Elementary Secondary Education; *Interpersonal Relationship; *Principals; *Teacher Administrator Relationship; Teacher Attitudes

IDENTIFIERS *Delegation of Authority; Delegation of Tasks

ABSTRACT

This study assessed teachers' perceptions of school principals, examining how teachers perceived their principals in demonstrating delegation and relationships skills. Principals were categorized according to various demographic variables, and data were examined to identify principals perceived as exhibiting stronger delegation and relationships skills. Participants were teachers enrolled in evening courses to become certified as school administrators or who were completing requirements for a master's degree in administration and supervision. Participants completed the Principal Profile survey. Data analysis indicated that principals who differed in age also differed in how well they delegated responsibilities. Younger principals were perceived to be more willing to delegate authority and responsibilities among faculty, and they were seen as demonstrating characteristics leading to better relationships with faculty. Female principals were perceived as having stronger delegation skills than males, though their relationships skills were not significantly stronger. School principals did not differ in their demonstration of relationships and delegation skills according to the school level in which they worked. School enrollment did not affect relationships and delegation skills. Overall, age was the most significant variable in determining whether principals were perceived to engage in relationships and delegation activities. The survey is appended. (Contains 18 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original document.

ED 450 077

AN INVESTIGATION OF TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THEIR PRINCIPALS' "DELEGATION" AND "RELATIONSHIPS" BEHAVIOR

Dr. Otis LoVette, Professor

Educational Leadership

University of Louisiana at Monroe

Susie Watts

Graduate Student in Educational Leadership

Louisiana Educational Consortium

Joanne Hood

Graduate Student in Educational Leadership

Louisiana Educational Consortium

Mid-South Educational Research Association

Annual Meeting

Bowling Green, Kentucky

November 15-17, 2000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SP039751

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

O. LoVette

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

An Investigation of Teachers' Perceptions of their Principals'

"Delegation" and "Relationships" Behavior

Introduction

Student academic performance in our country's schools continues to be a major concern to parents, the business world, and politicians at all levels. Various types of reform measures are in place and continue to be implemented, often without benefit of "buy-in" by those who must carry out the reform, namely teachers and administrators. The desired improvement sought has most often been translated into a need to produce higher test scores which will compare favorably with those of students in other countries, but the concern does not end there; our publics are insisting this improvement be accomplished in a short period of time. They are demanding that schools be accountable for improving student academic performance and various state testing programs have been initiated that evoke undesirable consequences for poor school performance.

Are there reasons why the intense efforts to improve student academic performance are not producing the desired results? Even with the expanded use and availability of technology, improvements in teacher-training programs, an increase in the quantity and quality of staff development, and the implementation of programs designed to remediate or punish educators and schools who do not "produce," efforts to improve student performance continue to be disappointing.

It should be noted that the various reforms that are being implemented are invariably imposed in a "top-down" fashion and educators at all levels are seldom included in decisions that directly impact them. Consequently, these educators may be less receptive to reform initiatives than had they otherwise been involved in the process and able to develop a sense of ownership of

the goals. Educators also complain that soon after they get accustomed to one initiative, they must shift gears and begin a new change in a different direction; thus, enthusiasm about new improvement efforts is often lacking. Teachers even credit administrators for stress and other disabling conditions they encounter. When teachers do not have the opportunity to assist in school decision making and are not made to feel valued, they develop negative feelings resulting in stress (McConaghy, 1993). Weiss (1993) indicated that school mechanisms enabling teachers to create a sense of ownership in the decisions are valuable for sustaining reform. Weiss further stated, "Without teacher commitment, even the best conceptualized reform is destined for failure" (p. 88).

Are there ways of improving what is going on within our school systems without imposing drastic changes? Many educators would readily admit that we know how to do things much better than we actually do them. Often the discrepancy is due to time or money constraints, but it may also be due to the natural resistance to change, politics, and the desire to ride it out (and this too shall soon pass). Teachers realize that many reforms being introduced resemble previously failed efforts. A positive approach is difficult to formulate when teachers possess a cynical attitude (Deal, 1990).

As previously noted, most of what has "come down," as far as change and accountability initiatives, has been imposed from the top. Educators know that mandates from the top are rarely well received by those who must implement them, especially if there is a coercive element involved. Etzionni (1961) suggested that reactions to the use of coercive power are probably closer to "rejection" than "acceptance," and may be something more like "aggression" and "hostility" and certainly do not elicit an embracing and empowering response.

Changes in our society, especially during the past ten years, require that school leaders

have different competencies, or at least modification of competencies, if they are to be effective (Kaiser, 1995). The principal's leadership style and management skills effect both the culture and climate of the school (Short & Greer, 1997). Research indicates that schools having poor leadership are rarely effective. Rallis and Highsmith (1986) posited that a principal could not be a good manager of the nuts and bolts of educational administration and also be a first-class school leader. They suggested that instructional leadership should be invested in teachers and the principal should stick to administrative/managerial duties. Perhaps the principal needs to become more of a motivator, facilitator, and empowerer of others. Rosenholtz (1989) discussed the importance of building principals in shaping the organizational conditions under which teachers work. He also linked teacher commitment to supportive principal behaviors such as feedback, encouragement, acknowledgement, use of participative decision making, and collaborative problem solving.

There has been considerable discussion in the literature about the role of leaders in effective schools. Johnson and Johnson (1984) indicated that effective schools research has promoted changes in the "perceived" role of the school principal. In the past, the principal was often seen as a teacher with little or no knowledge of school administration. Today, the opposite seems true. In fact, principals may have limited knowledge of the technology of teaching, yet many expect today's principal to be the "instructional leader" in the school.

Bartell (1994) indicated that the school principal has a powerful impact upon the success or failure of a school. Even though there seems to be a lack of consensus in the literature regarding the roles of today's and tomorrow's principals, it seems to be well accepted that they are and will be expected to do new and different things. Glickman (1990) acknowledged that future administrators will have to use what time they have more efficiently and equitably, thus implying

the utilization of non-traditional approaches to staff supervision and other areas of responsibility (perhaps sharing decision-making and the delegation of power and responsibility to stakeholders).

Research conducted by Kochan and Spencer (1999) indicated that principals' jobs had become increasingly complex. The majority of the principals indicated that they would be retiring within the next ten years. The individuals who assume these vacancies will need to possess a myriad of competencies. One assumption, based on Kochan and Spencer's research, is that many of the "older" principals who are on the verge of retiring may not "have what it takes." These principals may not posses the competencies or leadership styles necessary to utilize an empowering approach and be responsive to the changes introduced in numerous reform movements.

The value of ownership in an organization is well documented by numerous researchers and scholars. There is abundant evidence to show that teachers and others respond well to empowering-type activities, approaches, and leadership styles which provide ownership and the accompanying responsibility. Short and Greer (1997) discussed in detail the many benefits of empowering teachers in their book entitled "Leadership in Empowered Schools." Lightfoot (1986) also indicated that empowerment builds teacher commitment and involvement. When teachers realize and accept their own lack of power, especially with the many mandates that go along with accountability measures and autocratic school leaders, their potential for improved performance and job satisfaction is diminished. According to Frase and Sorenson (1992), what is lost when teachers are not empowered is the creativity, commitment, and energy that teachers could be contributing to the organization. Teachers often have little to say about what happens in their schools, leaving them with a sense of powerlessness which certainly does not promote their enthusiastic acceptance of change and their improved performance. Robert DeBlois (2000) stated:

> Sometimes leaders forget how much they need the committed expertise of their colleagues. After a while, some of us begin to think we know the answers, and we try to convince (or tell) others that we know "what is best." We tend to forget "what is best" may come from a process of discussion rather than from a dialogue between a person who thinks he know the answers and those who understand that they don't. In short, a small degree of knowledge about some particular problem - like students writing on the walls of the bathroom - may block our ability to find a real solution. As leaders, we should never forget the value of our own ignorance. (p. 26)

Stein and King (1992) claimed that principals must realize the best way to reach a school's goals is to be willing to delegate power and responsibility to others. Weiss (1993) indicated that when teachers gain a sense of ownership they will commit to following through on decisions. Teachers need feelings of significance and self-worth, which can be enhanced through the use of empowering activities such as delegation, if they are to be most effective. In the Montgomery-McMinn (1990-1991) research regarding teacher perceptions of school climate, it was stated, "In schools where administrators establish high expectations, set good examples, and solicit input, the climate is perceived as being more positive. Teachers were motivated more in schools where a positive perception was evident" (p. 55). Are principals aware of the value of empowering their staffs? Have principals been adequately trained to provide empowerment for teachers?

The researchers recognize that many of the reform and accountability measures being implemented in schools are beyond the control of building principals. But what can principals do through their relationships with teachers that could improve teacher performance? If delegation of power to teachers can be recognized as a way to get greater performance, as they may be afforded ownership with the accompanying responsibility, are principals perceived as using such

approaches? Kirby and Blase (1991) indicated in their research regarding teacher perceptions and collaborative efforts that principals need reliable assessment of teacher perceptions.

This study assessed teacher perceptions of school principals and examined how teachers perceived their principals in demonstrating "Delegation" and "Relationships" skills. Principals were categorized according to various demographic variables, and data was examined to identify those principals perceived as exhibiting stronger delegation and relationships skills. The items included under the headings of "Relationships" and "Delegation" were taken from a previously used survey which included headings of "Management" and "Personal Qualities." The original survey instrument was prepared using input from graduate students regarding their perceptions of what should be considered desirable qualities or actions of building principals. In this investigation, the items included under the heading of "Relationships" all began with action verbs and described types of desirable personal actions that could be completed by the principal. The items under the heading of "Delegation" also began with action verbs and described types of behavior considered to be desirable, but related specifically to empowering-type activities.

Problem

How can student academic performance in our country's schools be improved? Are there changes in school leader behavior that could enhance teacher performance and thus student performance? Effective leader behavior in schools has been addressed by a wealth of research in an effort to identify behaviors which appear to be conducive to effective teacher performance, as well as those which appear to be counterproductive. Numerous studies and speculative writings have also focused on the value of teacher empowerment in schools as a means of improving teacher satisfaction and providing ownership for schools' missions, goals, and objectives. This investigation attempted to answer several questions relative to the perceptions of teachers

regarding their principal's "Relationships" and "Delegation" skills.

Research Questions

1. Are female principals perceived as exhibiting stronger "Relationships" and "Delegation" skills than their male counterparts?
2. Are younger principals perceived as exhibiting stronger "Relationships" and "Delegation" skills than their older counterparts?
3. Are principals of elementary schools perceived as exhibiting stronger "Relationships" and "Delegation" skills than their counterparts in junior high and middle schools, or high schools?
4. Are principals of smaller schools perceived as exhibiting stronger "Relationships" and "Delegation" skills than their counterparts in larger schools?
5. Are principals who are perceived as exhibiting strong "Delegation" skills also perceived as exhibiting strong "Relationships" skills?

Participants and Design

This research was conducted using the survey responses of graduate students in the Educational Leadership Program at the University of Louisiana at Monroe. Surveys were administered during the spring, summer I, summer II, and fall semesters of 2000. Students surveyed were teachers enrolled in evening courses to become certified as school administrators (having previously earned masters degrees) or were completing the requirements for a masters degree in Administration and Supervision. Students in the Program were typically from a 15 parish (i.e., county) area in north Louisiana. Students were asked to complete a survey entitled Principal Profile (Appendix A), which asked them to rate their building principals on items related to "Delegation" and "Relationships." Identification of respondents and principals was not requested

on the survey, but respondents provided demographic data to be used for statistical analysis. The "Profile" consisted of 34 items and was a subset of a previously used instrument that contained 133 items (Appendix B). A total of 93 students responded with completed surveys (N=93).

Respondents were asked to evaluate their building principals on each item included in the survey. Assessment was based on a five-point Likert scale, with a score of 5 suggesting that the principal was perceived to be demonstrating the criterion at a level considered "outstanding." Alternative levels of demonstration included 4 as "clearly above average," 3 as "average," 2 as "clearly below average," and 1 as "unacceptable."

Demographic Data

Demographic data were analyzed and frequencies determined for each category relative to gender of the principal, age of the principal, gender of the respondent, age of the respondent, grade level of the school, and school enrollment. These frequencies are presented in tabular form for reference.

Table 1 displays the gender of the subjects (principals).

Table 1.

Subject Gender

Male	Female	No Response	Total
47	35	11	93

Table 2 displays the age of the subjects (principals).

Table 2.

Subject Age

Under 30	31-40	41-50	51-60	Over 60	No Response	Total
1	16	31	38	5	2	93

Table 3 displays the gender of the respondents who completed the survey.

Table 3.

Respondent Gender

Male	Female	No Response	Total
16	75	2	93

Table 4 displays the age of the respondents who completed the survey.

Table 4.

Respondent Age

Under 30	31-40	41-50	51-60	No Response	Total
21	32	28	3	9	93

Table 5 displays the school organization types represented.

Table 5.

Elementary School	Jr. High/Middle School	High School	Other	Total
50	17	23	1	93

Table 6 displays the school enrollment of the participants.

Table 6.

Under 250	251-500	501-750	751-1000	1001-1500	Over 1500	No Response	Total
10	42	20	10	3	5	3	93

Analysis of Data

A composite index for "Relationships" was calculated from the 21 items (1-21) on the survey (Appendix A). Each of the 21 items was correlated with the "Relationships" composite index using Pearson Correlation Coefficients. All items had a strong positive

relationship ($p < .05$) with the "Relationships" composite index. Similarly, a composite index for "Delegation" was calculated from the 13 items (22-34) on the survey (Appendix A) characterizing delegation activities. Each of these 13 items was correlated with the "Delegation" composite index using Pearson Correlation Coefficients. All 13 items had a strong positive relationship with the "Delegation" composite index ($p < .05$). Because of the strong positive correlations between each survey item and the respective composite index, further statistical analyses used the composite index for "Relationships" and "Delegation" to determine statistical differences in means among various groups of administrators.

Levene's test for equality of variance was used to determine if group variances were homogeneous. All analyses for homogeneity of variance resulted in F values that were significant at $p > .05$. Therefore, equal variance among groups was assumed in all analyses. The one-tailed independent samples t test for equality of means was used to determine significant differences in the mean "Relationships" and "Delegation" indices among different groups of administrators at the 95% confidence level. As indicated by the research questions, researchers predicted the direction in which mean differences would occur. Therefore, for all group comparisons the directional t test was used and critical t values determined at an alpha level of .10.

Research Questions

1. Are female principals perceived as exhibiting stronger "Relationships" and "Delegation" skills than their male counterparts?

The mean score for female principals on the "Relationships" composite index was higher than the mean score for male principals (see Table 1). However, a one-tailed independent t test comparing the two mean scores found that the mean for females was not significantly greater than the mean for males at $p = .10$. When females were compared with their male counterparts on the

"Delegation" composite index, the mean for females was significantly greater than the mean for males. Female principals were perceived to demonstrate the activities characteristic of "Delegation" more so than were male principals.

TABLE 1

COMPARING GENDER MEANS

Variable	Gender	n	M	SD	t	df	sig. (one-tailed)
Relationships	Male	47	72.1455	17.5706	-1.082	80	.283
	Female	35	76.5286	18.9021			
Delegation	Male	47	43.8885	12.7108	-1.774	80	.080*
	Female	35	49.0406	13.4072			

* Significant at p = .10

2. Are younger principals perceived as exhibiting stronger "Relationships" and "Delegation" skills than their older counterparts?

Table 2 displays the results of t-test analyses comparing the mean "Relationships" and "Delegation" composite indices among principals in different age categories. The mean for principals of age "31-40" on the "Relationships" index was significantly greater than the mean for principals of age "51-60." Principals of age "41-50" also scored significantly greater on the "Relationships" composite index than did principals of age "51-60." Although the mean for principals of age "31-40" was higher than the mean for principals of age "41-50", the mean was not significantly higher based on the t-test analysis. The mean "Delegation" composite index for principals of age "31-40" was not significantly higher than the mean for principals of age "41-50"

or "51-60" and principals of age "41-50" did not score significantly higher on the "Delegation" composite index than principals of age "51-60."

For further analysis, all principals were grouped into two age categories, "less than or equal to 50 years of age" and "greater than 50 years of age." The mean "Relationships" composite index for principals "less than or equal to 50 years of age" was found to be significantly greater than the mean for principals "greater than 50 years of age." The mean for principals "less than or equal to 50 years of age" was also significantly greater than principals "over the age of 50 years" on the "Delegation" composite index.

TABLE 2

COMPARING AGE GROUP MEANS

Variable	Age	n	M	SD	t	df	sig. (one-tailed)
Relationships	31-40	16	78.3906	14.5845	.308	45	.760
	41-50	31	76.6774	19.5966			
Relationships	31-40	16	78.3906	14.5845	2.200	52	.032*
	51-60	38	68.0353	16.2619			
Relationships	41-50	31	76.6774	19.5966	2.002	67	.049*
	51-60	38	68.0353	16.2619			
Relationships	≤ 50 years	48	77.0052	17.7989	2.469	89	.015*
	> 50 years	43	68.1242	16.3431			
Delegation	31-40	16	47.9819	10.8174	.132	45	.896
	41-50	31	47.4516	14.0874			
Delegation	31-40	16	47.9819	10.8174	.595	52	.117
	51-60	38	42.3034	12.3787			
Delegation	41-50	31	47.4516	14.0874	1.615	67	.111
	51-60	38	42.3034	12.3787			
Delegation	≤ 50 years	48	47.7856	12.8535	2.009	89	.048*
	> 50 years	43	42.4926	12.2023			

* Significant at $p < .10$

3. Are principals of elementary schools perceived as exhibiting stronger "Relationships" and "Delegation" skills than their counterparts in junior high and middle schools, or high schools?

As indicated by Table 3, the mean "Relationships" and "Delegation" composite indices for principals of elementary schools was not significantly greater than the mean "Relationships"

and "Delegation" composite indices for principals in junior high/middle schools or high schools. Principals from junior high/middle schools and high schools were combined to form a single group (other) and the mean of this group of principals was compared with the mean of elementary school principals on the two indices. The means for elementary school principals on the "Relationships" and "Delegation" composite indices were not significantly greater than the mean for the principals representing the combined group.

TABLE 3

COMPARING SCHOOL LEVEL MEANS

Variable	Level	n	M	SD	t	df	sig. (one-tailed)
Relationships	Elementary	50	73.9300	18.3511	.413	65	.681
	Junior High/ Middle School	17	71.7406	20.4827			
Relationships	Elementary	50	73.9300	18.3511	-.001	71	.999
	High School	23	73.9348	16.6427			
Relationships	Elementary	50	73.9300	18.3511	.259	91	.796
	Other	43	72.9556	17.7812			
Delegation	Elementary	50	45.1764	13.2340	-.202	65	.840
	Junior High/ Middle School	17	45.9412	14.1795			
Delegation	Elementary	50	45.1764	13.2340	-.441	71	.661
	High School	23	46.6117	12.2296			
Delegation	Elementary	50	45.1764	13.2340	-.417	91	.677
	Other	43	46.3040	12.6923			

4. Are principals of smaller schools perceived as exhibiting stronger "Relationships" and "Delegation" skills than their counterparts in larger schools?

Table 4 presents the means and standard deviations for each of the six categories of school enrollment on the "Relationships" and "Delegation" composite indices. Prior to any statistical treatment of the data, it was evident that the mean "Relationships" and "Delegation" composite indices increased as school enrollment increased, except in schools with enrollment "above 1500." To test the hypothesis that principals in smaller schools exhibit stronger "Relationships" and "Delegation" skills than their counterparts in larger schools, school enrollment groups were combined to form two groups represented by larger samples. Principals in schools with enrollment "less than or equal to 500 students" were compared to principals in schools with enrollment "greater than 500 students" on the "Relationships" and "Delegation" composite indices. Table 5 displays the results of the independent samples t test comparing the means of these two groups of principals. The means on the "Relationships" and "Delegation" composite indices were smaller for principals in schools with smaller enrollment. Although the mean differences among the two groups were not significantly different, principals from schools with larger enrollment had slightly higher means on the composite indices.

TABLE 4

MEANS FOR SCHOOL ENROLLMENT CATEGORIES

Variable	Level	n	M	SD
Relationships	Under 250	10	72.7250	19.9744
	251-500	42	72.8593	17.8810
	501-750	20	74.8000	17.6146
	751-1000	10	79.6250	18.0882
	1001-1500	3	75.6667	12.8970
	Above 1500	5	66.8000	17.4126
Delegation	Under 250	10	44.1710	14.5855
	251-500	42	45.3683	12.7775
	501-750	20	47.3500	12.3471
	751-1000	10	49.7710	10.8314
	1001-1500	3	54.6667	3.5119
	Above 1500	5	35.0000	12.3491

TABLE 5

COMPARING SCHOOL ENROLLMENT MEANS

Variable	Enrollment	n	M	SD	t	df	sig. (one-tailed)
Relationships	≤ 500	52	72.8335	18.0955	-.595	88	.553
	> 500	38	75.0885	17.1931			
Delegation	≤ 500	52	45.1381	13.0008	-.665	88	.508
	>500	38	46.9397	12.2613			

5. Are principals who are perceived as exhibiting strong "Delegation" skills also perceived as exhibiting strong "Relationships" skills?

The "Relationship" composite index ($\underline{M}$ = 73.4795) was correlated with the "Delegation" composite index ($\underline{M}$ = 45.6977) using a Pearson correlation coefficient. A strong positive relationship was found between the two indices ($\underline{r}$ = .889, $\underline{p}$ < .001). Principals that scored high on the "Relationships" index also tended to score high on the "Delegation" index.

Findings and Conclusions

Based upon the analysis of data, principals who differed in age also differed in how well they delegated responsibilities. Younger principals were perceived to be more willing to delegate authority and responsibilities among their faculties. Younger principals were also favored for demonstrating characteristics that lead to better relationships among faculties. Current principal training programs and staff development on effective leadership encourage principals to develop and use skills that foster positive relationships and delegation of authority among faculty members. Older principals may have received their leadership training when an "autonomous" style of leadership was in vogue. Another possible explanation as to why older principals received lower "Relationships" and "Delegation" ratings may involve their possible reluctance to modify existing philosophical beliefs regarding leadership.

Although female principals were perceived to exhibit significantly stronger "Delegation" skills than their male counterparts, their "Relationships" skills were not significantly stronger than males. However, the mean "Relationships" composite index for females was greater than the mean score for males.

School principals did not differ in their demonstration of "Relationships" and "Delegation" skills based upon the school level in which they were employed. Hence, high

school principals were perceived as being just as competent in these skills as were elementary school principals. The school enrollment factor did not influence the demonstration of "Relationships" and "Delegation" skills among principals. Although the means were not significantly larger, principals in larger schools had higher means on measures of "Relationships" and "Delegation" skills than principals in smaller schools. This unexpected result may be attributed to the large faculties that must be accommodated by principals in larger schools. Principals in larger schools, if for no other reason than necessity, must depend upon other faculty members to communicate directives to the entire faculty and share school responsibilities.

It was also noted that variables related to the school (school level and enrollment) resulted in no significant differences in group means on the "Relationships" and "Delegation" indices. The variables related to the individual principal (gender and age) resulted in group means on the "Relationships" and "Delegation" indices that were significantly different. Future research will target these variables in an effort to understand how they influence effective leadership, teacher and student performance, and teaching and learning.

Recommendations

These results have implications for further study on teacher perceptions of their principals as delegators, or those who share authority and responsibility. Age appeared to be the most significant variable in determining whether or not administrators were perceived to engage in "Relationships" and "Delegation" activities. Differences in the training received by administrators serve as a possible explanation as to why younger principals are perceived to demonstrate these skills more so than older principals. Modern training for leadership positions in education has generally changed to include a strong focus on the value of sharing power with faculties and using

concepts related to site-based decision-making and empowerment of stakeholders. Past training programs did not include such a strong focus on sharing power and responsibility.

Further research, identifying the training programs attended by school administrators, may provide valuable information about the effect of training programs on leadership styles that foster empowerment of all employees. Additionally, it is recommended that "older" principals enhance their "Delegation" skills by engaging in professional development programs that focus on the value of sharing school power.

References

Bartell, C. (1994). Preparing future administrators: Stakeholders' perceptions. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Deal, T. E. (1990). Reframing reform. Educational Leadership, 47 (8), 6-12.

DeBlois, R. (2000). The everyday work of leadership. Phi Delta Kappan, 82 (1), 25-27.

Etzioni, A. (1961). Modern organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Frase, L. E., & Sorenson, L. (1992). Teacher motivation and satisfaction: Impact on participatory management. NASSP Bulletin, 76 (540), 37-44.

Glickman, C. D. (1990). Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1984). The principal's role. Curriculum Report, 9 (10), 4.

Kaiser, J. S. (1995). The 21st century principal. WI: Stylex.

Kirby, P. C., & Blase, J. J. (1991). Teachers' perceptions of principals effect collaborative efforts. NASSP Bulletin 75, 111-115.

Kochan, F. K., & Spencer, W. A. (1999). Preparing leaders for tomorrow's schools: The practitioners' perspective. Research in the Schools, 6 (1), 9-16.

Lightfoot, S. L. (1986). On the goodness of schools: Themes of empowerment. Peabody Journal of Education, 63 (3), 9-28.

McConaghy, T. (1993). Teacher wellness: An educational concern. Phi Delta Kappan, 74 (3), 349-350.

Montgomery-McMinn, C. (1990-91). The relationship between teachers' perceptions of school climate and their compliance with administrative directives. National Forum of Applied Educational Research Journal, 4 (1), 50-55.

Rallis, S. F., & Highsmith, M. C. (1986). The myth of the "great principal": Questions of school management and instructional leadership. Phi Delta Kappan 68, 300-304.

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). Workplace conditions that affect teacher quality and commitment: Implications for teacher induction programs. Elementary School Journal 89 (4), 421-439.

Short, P. M., & Greer, J. T. (1997). Leadership in Empowered Schools. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Stein, R. & King, B. (1992). Is restructuring a threat to principals' power? NASSP Bulletin 76 (540), 26-31.

Weiss, C. H. (1993). Shared decision making about what? A comparison of schools with and without teacher participation. Teachers College Record 95 (1), 69-92.

Appendix A

Principal Profile (34 items)

PRINCIPAL PROFILE

This instrument is to be used to obtain a comprehensive assessment of teacher and/or principal perception of various aspects of the building principal's/assistant principal's performance and personal qualities. It is hoped that the information obtained can be used as direction for professional growth for specific individuals and improvement in preparation programs. Please provide the following demographic data but do not provide your name. Individual teachers responding are not to be identified in any way.

The person being assessed is: Principal ___ Asst. Prin. ___ **They are:** Male ___ Female ___
Their approximate age is: Under 30 ___ 31-40 ___ 41-50 ___ 51-60 ___ Over 60 ___
I am: Male ___ Female ___ **And:** Under 30 ___ 31-40 ___ 41-50 ___ 51-60 ___ Over 60 ___

Grade Level:
___ Elementary
___ Junior High/Middle School
___ High School
___ Other _____

Approximate schools enrollment:
___ Under 250
___ 251- 500
___ 501- 750
___ 751- 1000
___ 1001- 1500
___ Above 1500

Please rate using the following scale: 5=outstanding, 4=clearly above average, 3=average, 2=clearly below average, 1=unacceptable

<u>Relationships</u>

1. ___ Shows consideration for staff ("staff" includes teachers and support personnel)
2. ___ Provides praise and recognition for staff
3. ___ Senses the temper or tone of faculty members on given issues
4. ___ Works to create interdependence among staff members
5. ___ Works to improve school climate (relationships)
6. ___ Stands up for teachers
7. ___ Involves parents in productive efforts with the school
8. ___ Rewards positive patterns of behavior
9. ___ Fosters collaboration and group efforts
10. ___ Develops loyalty in staff
11. ___ Supports staff consensus on issues
12. ___ Works to enhance group efforts

13. ___ Asks for faculty input

14. ___ Makes teachers feel like they are working toward common goals

15. ___ Maintains communication which is candid and productive

16. ___ Maintains productive relationships with students

17. ___ Maintains productive relationships with parents

18. ___ Effectively redirects negative patterns of behavior

19. ___ Celebrates/recognizes other's accomplishments

20. ___ Shares decision-making with teachers and other school staff members

21. ___ Empowers faculty to make decisions not bound by principal's possible censure

Delegation

22. ___ Delegates responsibility to others

23. ___ Trusts teachers to make mature judgements

24. ___ Gives teachers a sense of professional autonomy

25. ___ Creates opportunities for teachers to maximize their potential

26. ___ Stimulates teachers to use their intellect and creativeness

27. ___ Involves faculty in the development of school rules and regulations

28. ___ Enables others to act on their own

29. ___ Uses a committee approach to decision-making

30. ___ Shares power with faculty

31. ___ Gets things done, but doesn't do everything alone

32. ___ Delegates authority and provides backing for those given the authority

33. ___ Acknowledges the skills and intellect of faculty

34. ___ Causes me to want to volunteer for extra responsibility

Appendix B

Principal Profile (133 items)

PRINCIPAL PROFILE

This instrument is to be used to obtain a comprehensive assessment of teacher and/or principal perception of various aspects of the building principal's/assistant principal's performance and personal qualities which may impact teacher and student performance. It is hoped that the information obtained can be used as direction for professional growth for specific individuals and improvement in preparation programs for school principals. Individual teachers responding will not be identifiable.

The person being assessed is: Principal ___ Asst. Prin. ___

Please rate using the following scale: 5=outstanding, 4=clearly above average, 3=average, 2=clearly below average, 1=unacceptable

Management

1. ___ Accessible to staff and others
2. ___ Keeping us informed
3. ___ Visibility in the school setting
4. ___ Uses a minimum of instructional time for non-instructional tasks thus maximizing time on task
5. ___ Working effectively with the central (superintendent's) office
6. ___ Emphasizing staff productivity (on-task behavior by staff)
7. ___ Taking positions which are most beneficial to the school (on issues)
8. ___ Communicating clearly the vision or mission of the school
9. ___ Monitoring classroom performance by teachers
10. ___ Monitoring student performance and conduct
11. ___ Managing support staff (non-teachers)
12. ___ Managing school facilities
13. ___ Managing school finance
14. ___ Managing equipment and supplies
15. ___ Providing needed resources for staff
16. ___ Providing time for faculty to work collaboratively on curriculum, etc.
17. ___ Administering discipline effectively
18. ___ Letting others know what is expected of them
19. ___ Providing instructional leadership
20. ___ Supporting excellence in the performance of staff
21. ___ Providing for beneficial staff-development activities
22. ___ Demonstrating high expectations for self and others
23. ___ Providing leadership in curriculum development
24. ___ Providing a pleasant, safe, and orderly climate for learning

Relationships

25. ___ Shows consideration for staff ("staff" includes teachers and support personnel)
26. ___ Provides praise and recognition for staff
27. ___ Senses the temper or tone of faculty members on given issues
28. ___ Works to create interdependence among staff members
29. ___ Works to improve school climate (relationships)
30. ___ Stands up for teachers
31. ___ Involves parents in productive efforts with the school
32. ___ Rewards positive patterns of behavior
33. ___ Fosters collaboration and group efforts
34. ___ Develops loyalty in staff
35. ___ Supports staff consensus on issues
36. ___ Works to enhance group efforts
37. ___ Asks for faculty input
38. ___ Makes teachers feel like they are working toward common goals
39. ___ Maintains communication which is candid and productive
40. ___ Maintains productive relationships with students
41. ___ Maintains productive relationships with parents
42. ___ Effectively redirects negative patterns of behavior
43. ___ Celebrates/recognizes other's accomplishments
44. ___ Shares decision-making with teachers and other school staff members (when appropriate)
45. ___ Empowers faculty to make decisions not bound by principal's possible censure

Delegation

46. ___ Delegates responsibility to others
47. ___ Trusts teachers to make mature judgements
48. ___ Gives teachers a sense of professional autonomy
49. ___ Creates opportunities for teachers to maximize their potential
50. ___ Stimulates teachers to use their intellect and creativeness
51. ___ Involves faculty in the development of school rules and regulations
52. ___ Enables others to act on their own
53. ___ Uses a committee approach to decision-making (when appropriate)
54. ___ Shares power with faculty
55. ___ Gets things done, but doesn't do everything alone
56. ___ Delegates authority and provides backing for those given the authority
57. ___ Acknowledges the skills and intellect of faculty
58. ___ Causes me to want to volunteer for extra responsibility

Personal Qualities

59. ___ Works with staff in collegial, non-threatening ways
60. ___ Understands people
61. ___ Demonstrates knowledge of school administration
62. ___ Makes decisions and follows through

63. ___ Works well with individuals and groups
64. ___ Demonstrates personal warmth and caring
65. ___ Is inspiring to others
66. ___ Acts as a positive catalyst to get things done
67. ___ Sets a good example for teachers and others
68. ___ Stays well-informed about school issues
69. ___ Is patient
70. ___ Tolerates stress well without taking it out on others
71. ___ Is friendly
72. ___ Uses time effectively
73. ___ Has good organizational skills
74. ___ Exercises good judgement
75. ___ Spends the time it takes to get the job done
76. ___ Uses a democratic approach
77. ___ Is persuasive
78. ___ Takes a risk when it could benefit students or school
79. ___ Is open and candid with others
80. ___ Is flexible (able to "roll with the punches")
81. ___ Is honest
82. ___ Has good planning skills
83. ___ Is effective
84. ___ Is fair
85. ___ Has good problem solving abilities
86. ___ Is reliable
87. ___ Accepts responsibility for her/his actions
88. ___ Is dependable
89. ___ Provides a good model for teachers
90. ___ Is consistent
91. ___ Has good communication skills
92. ___ Is predictable
93. ___ Is dynamic
94. ___ Is decisive (in a good way)
95. ___ Is resourceful
96. ___ Is charismatic
97. ___ Is intelligent
98. ___ Is energetic
99. ___ Is well-informed
100. ___ Demonstrates perseverance (sticks to it until accomplished)
101. ___ Is respected by staff
102. ___ Has the staff's confidence
103. ___ Relates well to the community

The following are qualities or actions which generally are considered negative. Please provide your perceptions of your principal using a scale of 5-1 with 5=very much so/often; 4=generally so; 3=sometimes/occasionally; 2=rarely; 1=not at all/never.

104. __ Paternalistic (treats us like children)
105. __ Lacks knowledge
106. __ Has poorly defined goals
107. __ Tells us what to do in a negative fashion
108. __ Ideas for improvement are always the principals
109. __ Indecisive
110. __ Hard-headed/stubborn
111. __ Authoritarian/dictatorial
112. __ Blames others
113. __ We fear retaliation by the principal
114. __ Intimidates faculty and others
115. __ Is satisfied with the status quo (is negative about change)
116. __ Provides poor evaluation of instruction
117. __ Does not provide help for teachers who need help in their classrooms
118. __ Supervision efforts are absent or non-productive
119. __ Communication is limited and formal (not productive)
120. __ Does not recognize or reward special accomplishments
121. __ The way to get along with him/her is to conform
122. __ I and most of the faculty avoid contact with the principal/assistant principal
123. __ Is aggressive in a negative way
124. __ Is arrogant
125. __ Is lazy
126. __ Lacks expertise
127. __ Lacks direction
128. __ Lacks commitment
128. __ Is ambiguous
129. __ Is unduly critical
130. __ Is not accessible
131. __ Is manipulative
132. __ Plays favorites
133. __ Is defensive